DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 068 CG 013 493

TITLE	Evaluation of Florida's Intensive Counseling Program.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	Mar 77
NOTE	23p.; For related documents see CG 013 489-494
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Programs; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Followup Studies; *Parent Counseling; *Performance Contracts; Program Evaluation; *Recidivism; Rehabilitation Programs; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida Youth Services Program

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the pilot Intensive Counseling Program which serves juvenile delinquents with community-based group (eight to ten youths) counseling sessions that meet at least four times a week, and are less expensive and more personalized than traditional residential treatment. Youths and parents contract for the program and must be able to travel to the sessions. Besides conducting group sessions, counselors verify group discussions with related community persons, conduct required parent sessions, and provide community referral services. Program objectives of replacing other treatments and reducing recidivism more than other programs are met or exceeded. Data comparing Intensive Counseling graduates with a control group of youths furloughed from training school to "Aftercare" reveal differences only in offense type and prior commitments. These results point to consideration of these factors in candidate assignment. Care in drawing conclusions from the favorable low recidivism rate is cautioned. (LS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172068

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James T. Clark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluation of Florida's Intensive Counseling Program

CG

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Youth Services Program

PLANNING COORDINATION UNIT

PUB DATE 77

EDRS PRICE

DESCRIPTORS

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

BG013493

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Program Description	2
Admission Criteria	2
Treatment Approach	2
Staffing	3
Overview	3
Measureable Objectives	3
Evaluation Steps	4
Procedures	5
Evaluation Design	5
Results of Data Analysis	6
Comparison of Population Served by Training Schools and Intensive Counseling	6
Program Completion Date.	8
Differences Between Graduates and Non-Graduates.	8
Comparison of Graduates with Training School Control Group.	11
Graduate and Training School Control Recidivism Analysis.	14
Graduate Recidivism Analysis	16
Conclusion	16
Recommendations	18
Appendix 1	19

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Population Characteristics	7
Table 2:	Exit Categories	9
Table 3:	Program Completion Rates Fiscal Year 74-75	9
Table 4:	Relationship Between Background Variables and Program Completion	10
Table 5:	Graduate and Training School Control Group Characteristics	12 & 13
Table 6:	Success Rates by Program Type	15
Table 7:	Success Rates by Selected Categories	17

INTRODUCTION

For many of Florida's delinquent youths, treatment means commitment to Youth Services training schools. Following release from these training schools, the youths are placed on Aftercare--juvenile parole--under supervision of a Youth Services counselor. These counselors usually have about 35 to 45 cases to supervise.

The following report is an evaluation of the FY 74-75 Youth Services Intensive Counseling Program. This was a pilot program funded by Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) to determine if delinquent youths who would ordinarily be committed to a training school can, instead, be effectively rehabilitated in the community by a counselor with a limited caseload (8-10). It was felt that with this reduced caseload a counselor would have the time to become totally involved in changing the youths' behavior patterns. The primary thrust of the treatment program is the use of intensive groups which would meet a minimum of four times weekly.

Intensive counseling is an effort at community-based treatment which attempts to reduce the number of delinquent children being treated within large institutions where size often works against treatment objectives. The Intensive Counseling Program concept is in keeping with the DHRS goal of deinstitutionalization of its clients. Furthermore, it provides Youth Services with additional diversification of its programming approaches for delinquents by increasing the availability of community commitment slots. These slots provide a number of benefits; lower costs, increased access to local resources, and closer contact among youths, their families, and Aftercare counselors. Thus, the funding of the Intensive Counseling Program by LEAA has provided a unique opportunity for Youth Services to determine whether the traditional and expensive residential treatment approach can be effectively supplemented by a relatively inexpensive, non-residential program such as the Intensive Counseling Program. The basic questions which this study seeks to answer are:

1. Did the Intensive Counseling Program truly serve as an alternative to training schools? That is, were the populations served by the two programs similar?

2. If indeed the intensive counseling and training school programs served youths with similar characteristics, were the recidivism rates comparable?

3. How were those youths who successfully completed the programs different from those who failed to finish?

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Admission Criteria:

The program was initially designed such that youth were to be furloughed after a 30-day orientation period at a training school, and with the approval of the committing judge, assigned to the community Intensive Counseling Program.

In February 1975, however, these admission procedures were changed due to population pressures at the training schools to allow for the placement of youths directly into the program from the courts. This is the procedure currently utilized. In addition, the youth has to meet the following admission criteria:

1. He/she agrees to sign a special contract, in addition to the standard Supervision Agreement, and to attend intensive group meetings as outlined by the counselor in the contract.

2. The parents of the youth sign a contract to attend a parent group meeting one night a week.

3. The youth must live geographically close enough to the group meeting site so that no transportation hardships occur to prevent the youth from attending all group meetings. Since group attendance is strictly enforced, it is absolutely essential that there be no problems for the youths in getting to meetings because of transportation and distances to travel. It is possible that one absence without a verifiable excuse can result in the revocation of the youth's furlough and confinement in a training school. It should be noted that, because of this geographical factor, most--if not all--youngsters in the Intensive Program come from inner-city ghetto areas, which generally have high delinquency rates.

Treatment Approach:

Eight to ten delinquent youths comprise an Intensive Counseling group. Group sessions are the principal treatment mode of the Intensive Counseling Program and counselors are required to enforce attendance and thoroughly evaluate group effectiveness. Counselors must carefully prepare for each group meeting in order to focus on the priority problems of the group.

When not leading groups, counselors seek to verify the truth and validity of group discussions by contacting parents, teachers, employers, law enforcement officials, and other persons in the community who have knowledge of the youth's behavior when he/she is not in group. This infor-

mation is weighed and compared with a youth's discussion, behavior, participation, and progress in group, to determine if behavioral changes noted in group are genuine and are resulting in positive behavior in the community. Conversely, information gathered from community sources is used to help the counselor focus on members of the group who need the most attention. Counselors are also required to meet crisis situations that come up with members of the group.

Parents of the youths in the Intensive Counseling Program attend a parent group once a week. Parental support, if behavioral changes are to be effective and lasting, is an essential element of this program and the parent groups provide this ingredient. Counselors help parents discuss problems they are having with their children, and help them gain insight into how to deal effectively with them. A better understanding by parents of their relationship and responsibility to their children is sought as means of helping to strengthen family relationships.

In addition, counselors seek to employ all available community resources to assist the child by referring youths to other agencies for special needs: Vocational Rehabilitation, Mental Health agencies, Special Education classes, Drug Programs, and other agencies which may fill the needs of a youth. Volunteers are sought out by the counselors to supplement group and individual counseling. This represents an important resource to the counselor. In addition, recreational activities are planned by counselors to develop rapport, and demonstrate, in a relaxed situation, a sincere interest in helping the youths.

Staffing:

The Intensive Counseling Program began in September 1974 at the following locations, with the number of counselors indicated in parentheses: Jacksonville (2); Tampa (2); St. Petersburg (2); Fort Lauderdale (2); Miami (2); West Palm Beach (1); and Fort Pierce (1). A Youth Counselor Supervisor in Tampa supervised the counselors in Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Jacksonville. Counselors in Fort Lauderdale, Miami, West Palm Beach, and Fort Pierce were supervised by a Youth Counselor Supervisor based in Fort Lauderdale.

OVERVIEW

Measureable Objectives:

The Intensive Counseling Program was intended to achieve the following two objectives as specified in the LEAA grant application:

Objective 1

1. To displace 96 training school beds for committed delinquent youths by providing, as a treatment alternative, intensive counseling to these youths in a community setting during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974 and ending June 30, 1975.

2. Management Indicator: The average caseload must equal or exceed 96. Average caseload = $\frac{\text{sum of end counts for each month}}{\text{number of months.}}$

3. Progress: During FY 74-75, the overall average caseload was 94.8 which did not quite achieve the objective. However, the program did not begin operation until September and the average caseload figure of 89 for the first five months reflects this phase in period. The average caseload for the final 5 months was 100, which exceeded the objective.

Objective 2

1. One year from the date a youth is released from the Intensive Counseling Program into a regular caseload, an evaluation will be made to determine if there has been a reduction in delinquent behavior as a result of the youth's participation in the Intensive Counseling Program. Youths in the Intensive Program will be compared with a sample of children from the same geographical area who received treatment in a training school, and who are furloughed into the community under regular Aftercare supervision.

2. Management Indicator: This study reports in detail the results obtained from the follow-up and comparison stated above.

3. Progress: Of 108 youths released from the program to Aftercare, 31 (29%) re-entered Youth Services or the Adult System during the one-year follow-up (information could not be obtained on 5 exited youths). A control group composed of youths committed from the same geographical area and furloughed to Aftercare during the same time period, had much higher recidivism rates. (See page 13).

It can be concluded, therefore, that the Intensive Counseling Program met or exceeded the grant objectives for FY 74-75.

Evaluation Steps:

The evaluation component of the funding LEAA grant specified the following steps to be accomplished:

Step I: A recapitulation report will be developed to monitor the program on a monthly basis. It will show the number of youngsters who fail in the program, and why. Additions to the program will be shown as youngsters enter the program and as others are released to regular Aftercare supervision. These reports will be used for quarterly reports, and in the follow-up evaluation after the program ends June 30, 1975. (See page 9).

Step 2: Each youngster who completes the Intensive Program will be evaluated one year from the date he/she is released from the program to determine his/her status at that time. (See page 14).

Step 3: Youngsters from the same geographical area who receive treatment in a training school and are furloughed on Aftercare will be compared one year from the date of furlough, with the youngsters who completed the intensive group counseling program before moving to regular supervision. (See page 11).

Step 4: Average length of stay will be computed for youngsters who completed the Intensive Program and those who do not complete the program. (See page 10).

Again, the evaluation procedures were accomplished as set forth by the grant. The remainder of this report outlines the findings of the above evaluation steps.

PROCEDURES

Evaluation Design:

This study was primarily designed to accomplish two evaluation steps stipulated in the LEAA grant, namely:

1. To follow-up all youths released from the Intensive Counseling Program to Aftercare (henceforth referred to as "graduates") for one year after exit to determine recidivism rates and,

2. To compare the recidivism rates of these graduates to the recidivism rates of a comparable group of youths from the same geographical areas who were committed to training schools and subsequently furloughed to Aftercare (referred to as "controls").

In addition, a third step was incorporated in the study. That is, graduates were compared with those youths who failed to complete the program (the "non-graduates") to determine any differences between the two groups.

The study used an ex post facto design, utilizing materials from case records of youths released to Aftercare from each program. Each selected youth's record was examined to gather background data and to ascertain whether the youth had re-entered a Youth Services' program (revocation or recommitment) or entered the Adult System (probation, jail or prison). The follow-up was limited to the one-year period following the youth's release to Aftercare.

Background data was collected on the entire population of youths exiting the Intensive Counseling Program during FY 74-75* and a sample of the training

*Of the 230 youths exiting the program, 19 files either could not be located or were inaccessible for data collection.

school controls. The sample of controls was obtained by randomly selecting 75** youths from the furlough lists for 74-75. Furloughs from Lancaster were not considered since that facility was assumed to be treating the most serious offenders during that time period. Youths who had a prior placement in the Intensive Counseling Program were also excluded from the control group.

The follow-up was conducted only on the graduates and controls. For purposes of this study, post-treatment "success" and "failure" were defined as follows:

Success: Completion of the one-year period following release to Aftercare without re-entry into a Youth Services' Program, or entry into the Adult System (probation, jail, prison).

Failure: Re-entry into a Youth Services' Program or entry into the Adult System during the one-year period following release to Aftercare.

It should be noted that the definition of recidivism utilized in this study is expressed in absolute rather than in relative terms. This occasionally causes positive results to be obscured. That is, all subsequent offenders, regardless of frequency or seriousness of the offenses committed, were labelled "recidivists". It was, however, a definition that could be operationalized and measured with the available data.

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Comparison of Populations Served by Training Schools and Intensive Counseling:

In order to determine whether the Intensive Counseling Program truly served as an alternative to training school placement, the populations served by each program were examined. Table 1 below lists certain key characteristics of the youths treated by both programs during January - June 1975.

The Chi-Square statistical procedure found the two populations to be significantly different in terms of sex and offense. The population served by Intensive Counseling contained a higher percentage of females than that of training schools. Felony and CINS offenses were also over-represented in the Intensive Counseling group, while there were fewer offenses classified as "victimless". (See Appendix for the offenses in each category.)

**The eventual sample size was 68 as 7 files either could not be located or were inaccessible.

TABLE 1

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS[1]

VARIABLE	INTENSIVE COUNSELING[2]		TRAINING SCHOOLS[3]		
Sex					
Male	85%	(180)	94%	(1755)	Significant at .05 level
Female	15%	(31)	6%	(119)	
		(211)		(1874)	$X^2 = 19.7$, df = 1
Age at Commitment					
13	1%	(2)	4%	(84)	
14	11%	(18)	12%	(224)	
15	25%	(43)	22%	(421)	
16	25%	(44)	25%	(486)	
17	25%	(44)	27%	(522)	
18	13%	(23)	9%	(179)	
		(174)		(1916)	
	Mean age = 16.0		Mean age = 15.9		
Offense					
A. Persons	17%	(36)	14%	(260)	Significant at .05 level
Property	59%	(123)	54%	(1044)	$X^2 = 35.9$, df = 3
CINS[4]	9%	(19)	3%	(59)	
Victimless	15%	(31)	30%	(568)	
		(209)		(1931)	
B. Felony	69%	(144)	58%	(1123)	
Misdemeanor	12%	(25)	18%	(351)	Significant at .05 level
CINS[4]	9%	(19)	3%	(398)	$X^2 = 45.4$, df = 3
Probation or Aftercare Violation	10%	(21)	20%	(59)	
		(209)		(1931)	

[1]Only 3 common variables were available for comparison

[2]Data obtained from files of youths exiting Intensive Counseling during FY 74-75

[3]Data obtained from commitment printout. During FY 74-75, 174 of 281 (62%) admissions to Intensive Counseling were first sent to training school for 30 days. These 174 youths are included here in the training school statistics, but would not affect the overall percentages depicted in the Table.

[4]These youths were committed prior to July 1, 1975, at which time the "CINS" category was abolished by the Florida Legislature.

Thus, the populations served by the two programs are different with respect to sex and offense, but the effect of this difference on recidivism rates, for example, is unclear. Females, for instance, have been found by previous Youth Services' studies to have a significantly better post-program success rate than males. This factor would perhaps lead to a conclusion that Intensive Counseling should, therefore, have a lower recidivism rate than training schools. On the other hand, serious offenders are certainly being served in the community by the Intensive Counseling Program as evidenced by the higher percentage of felony offenders in that group. It must be stated, however, that prior Youth Services' studies have found no relationship between type of offense and subsequent recidivism. It should also be noted that the two groups are very similar with respect to age, a variable which has proven to be significantly related to recidivism in previous Youth Services' studies.

In conclusion, the populations served by the two programs appear to be different in some respects. However, a more comprehensive answer as to the effects of these differences is offered in a later section of this report in which the recidivism rates of the Intensive Counseling Program are compared with a sample of training school youths. In that analysis, all significant differences between the two groups are statistically controlled so that the effects of a higher proportion of females in one group, for example, are appropriately dealt with. Most importantly, however, the point remains that if the Intensive Counseling commitment slots had not been available, the youths would have been placed in training school for lack of an alternative placement. Consequently, the Intensive Counseling Program has served as an alternative to training school commitment even if the overall populations served by the two porgrams are dissimilar in certain respects.

PROGRAM COMPLETION RATE

During FY 74-75, 230 youths exited the Intensive Counseling Program. Of these, 113 or 49% completed the program and were released to regular Aftercare supervision. Table 2 displays the various exit categories and the number of youths associated with each.

At first glance, a 49% program completion rate appears to be rather low. For sake of comparison, however, Table 3 presents completion rates for other Youth Services' commitment programs during the same time period. As can be seen from the Table, the Intensive Counseling completion rate is relatively quite good. The completion rate appears even better, when considering the program policy regarding strict enforcement of group meeting attendance. That is, even one unexcused absence from group meeting can result in revocation to training school. During 74-75, 7% of all losses from the program were due to failure to attend group meetings. (See Table 2).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADUATES AND NON-GRADUATES

For operational and programming purposes, it is important to discern whether differences exist between those completing a treatment program and those who fail to finish. Obviously, if the graduates and non-graduates differ signifi

cantly on certain characteristics known at program entrance, either the program admission criteria or the program itself should be considered for modification. An examination of the relationship between background factors and subsequent in-program success or failure was, therefore, conducted. Table 4 illustrates certain variables and their association with the graduate and non-graduate groups.

TABLE 2

EXIT CATEGORIES

		% of Total	Number
1.	To regular Aftercare	49%	(113)
2.	Supervision agreement revoked-failure to attend group only	7%	(17)
3.	Supervision agreement revoked-other violation and/or failure to attend group	21%	(49)
4.	Supervision agreement revoked-new law violation	3%	(7)
5.	Recommitted to Youth Services by Juvenile Court	6%	(13)
6.	Recommitted to Youth Services by Adult Court	0%	(0)
7.	To Adult Probation	0%	(0)
8.	Committed to Department of Offender Rehabilitation	1%	(2)
9.	Absconded	9%	(21)
10.	Death	0%	(0)
11.	Other	4%	(8)
			(230)

TABLE 3

PROGRAM COMPLETION RATES FISCAL YEAR 74-75*

PROGRAM	COMPLETION RATE
Intensive Counseling	49%
Halfway Houses	33%
START Centers	35%
Group Treatment Homes	55%
Training Schools	78%

*Program completion means furlough from the program to Aftercare supervision: $\frac{\text{number furloughed to Aftercare}}{\text{total number of program exits}}$

TABLE 4

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BACKGROUND VARIABLES AND PROGRAM COMPLETION

VARIABLE	NO.	GRADUATE	NON-GRADUATE
Race			
Black	115	48% (55)	52% (60)
White	93	55% (51)	45% (42)
Sex			
Female	31	45% (14)	55% (17)
Male	180	52% (94)	48% (86)
Offense*			
Persons	36	72% (26)	28% (10)
Property	123	52% (56)	48% (67)
Victimless	9	56% (5)	44% (4)
CINS[1]	19	63% (12)	37% (7)
Other	22	41% (9)	59% (13)
Prior Commitments**			
None	128	57% (73)	43% (55)
One or more	78	41% (32)	59% (46)
Prior Referrals			
0 - 3	48	50% (24)	50% (24)
4 - 5	54	50% (27)	50% (27)
6 - 7	37	57% (21)	43% (16)
8 or more	51	59% (30)	41% (21)
Prior Probation			
Yes	169	50% (84)	50% (85)
No	30	57% (17)	43% (13)
Age			
13		0% (0)	3% (2)
14		11% (9)	10% (9)
15		24% (20)	25% (23)
16		25% (21)	25% (23)
17		25% (21)	25% (23)
18		15% (12)	12% (11)
		(83)	(91)
		mean age = 16.1	mean age = 16.0
Average Length of Stay (Days)		119	73

* Significant at .05 level - $X^2 = 10.03$, df = 4

** Significant at .05 level - $X^2 = 4.35$, df = 1

[1] These youths were committed prior to July 1, 1975, at which time the "CINS" category was abolished by the Florida Legislature.

As depicted by Table 4, the graduate and non-graduate groups differed only in terms of type of commitment offense and whether or not the youth had been previously committed. With regard to offense, the primary difference was in the high completion rate for individuals charged with crimes against persons as compared to the remaining offense categories. First commitment youths also enjoyed higher program completion rates than those with prior commitment histories.

On the basis of the results obtained, it would appear that in choosing candidates for the Intensive Counseling Program, preference might be given to persons offenders and first commitment youths. An important consideration, however, is that the persons offense category contains the offenses generally regarded by the public to be most serious. (See Appendix for Offense Classification). Therefore, regardless of research findings, the assignment of persons offenders to a non-residential program such as Intensive Counseling will continue to be a sensitive issue because of potential adverse community reaction.

The finding with regard to the favorable in-program success rates for first commitments was not unexpected. Other Youth Services' evaluations have found first commitments to have better post-program success rates in community-based programs as opposed to training schools. Thus, a recommendation to continue to give preference to first commitments in community-based program assignments appears to be sound not only for reasons of in-program but post-program success as well.

COMPARISON OF GRADUATES WITH TRAINING SCHOOL CONTROL GROUP

This section reports the results obtained when comparing Intensive Counseling graduates with a control group of youths furloughed from training school to Aftercare as specified by the evaluation component of the LEAA funding grant. Table 5 presents a breakdown of the graduate and control groups on certain variables as well as indicating whether differences between the two groups were statistically significant. As shown by Table 5, significant differences were found between the two groups in regard to prior commitments, age, average length of stay, and recidivism. The graduate group was older, contained a higher proportion of first commitments, and displayed a much higher success rate than the control group. As indicated, the graduates had a shorter length of stay in the program than the training school controls. Because of these statistical differences between the Intensive Counseling and training school groups, the variables of age and prior commitments were controlled in the recidivism analysis that follows.

TABLE 5

GRADUATE AND TRAINING SCHOOL CONTROL GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

VARIABLE	GRADUATE	CONTROL	
Race			
Black	52% (55)	47% (32)	
White	48% (51)	53% (36)	
	(106)	(68)	
Sex			
Female	13% (14)	12% (8)	
Male	87% (94)	88% (60)	
	(108)	(68)	
Offense			
Persons	24% (26)	15% (10)	
Property	52% (56)	51% (35)	
Victimless	5% (5)	3% (2)	
CINS	11% (12)	2% (1)	
Other	8% (9)	29% (20)	
	(103)	(68)	
Prior Commitments			
None	70% (73)	44% (30)	Significant at .05 level
One or more	30% (32)	56% (38)	$X^2 = 10.03$, df = 1
	(105)	(68)	
Age			
13	0% (0)	2% (1)	
14	11% (9)	15% (10)	
15	24% (20)	32% (22)	
16	25% (21)	28% (19)	
17	25% (21)	20% (14)	
18	15% (12)	3% (2)	
	(83)	(68)	
	Mean age = 16.1	15.6	Significant at .05 level
			Student's t = 2.512, df = 149

TABLE 5 (continued)

GRADUATE AND TRAINING SCHOOL CONTROL GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

VARIABLE	GRADUATE	CONTROL	
Geographical Area			
Jacksonville	32% (34)	28% (19)	
St. Petersburg	15% (16)	16% (11)	
Tampa	20% (21)	18% (12)	
West Palm	2% (2)	4% (3)	
Fort Pierce	9% (9)	7% (5)	
Ft. Lauderdale	12% (13)	15% (10)	
Miami	10% (11)	12% (8)	
	(106)	(68)	
Average Length of Stay (days)	119	152	Significant at .05 level Student's t = 3.528, df = 174
Recidivism			
Success	71% (75)	44% (30)	Significant at .05 level
Failure	29% (31)	56% (38)	X^2 = 12.28, df = 1
	(106)	(68)	

GRADUATE AND TRAINING SCHOOL CONTROL RECIDIVISM ANALYSIS

As earlier noted, the Chi Square procedure found a statistically significant relationship between type of program and recidivism. That is, the Intensive Counseling graduates were associated with a much higher success rate (71%) than the training school controls (44%) with the same length of follow-up. An analytic method often used to explore the circumstances under which a relationship holds is to counter the influence of other variables on the relationship by statistically controlling for them. Thus, it can be determined if any of the differences in recidivism between the two groups can be attributed to differences in the characteristics of the two samples. Accordingly, the relationship between type of program and recidivism can be examined while holding race, for example, constant. If the relationship then holds for both whites and blacks, race cannot be considered as a factor in the success rate differential between the graduate and control groups. This is particularly important in the case of the variables of age and prior commitments, since they were found to have significantly different distributions in the two groups (see Table 5). Table 6 illustrates the results when controlling for prior commitments and age.

As illustrated in Table 6, the relationship between the Intensive Counseling graduates and high success rates continues to hold for both categories of the prior commitments variable. Therefore, prior commitment cannot be considered as a factor in the high success rates of the Intensive Counseling graduates.

On the other hand, the relationship between success and type of program did not hold for any age group except the 16-year-olds. The Table indicates that older youths, regardless of program type, had higher success than younger youths. This relationship has also been found by other Youth Services' studies as well. Therefore, one could reasonably expect the Intensive Counseling graduate's success rates to be somewhat higher than the training school controls, other things being equal, simply because the graduate group is older then the control group (16.1 and 15.6 years respectively.

Extreme care should be exercised in making conclusions regarding the statistically significant differences between the Intensive Counseling and training school groups. A comparison of recidivism rates should not be considered as a direct comparison of the effectiveness of the two treatment programs. While both the Intensive Counseling and training school groups were limited to graduates of the two respective programs, the training school group was in part comprised of youths who had initially been placed in other Youth Services programs prior to transfer to training schools and subsequent furlough to Aftercare. In other words, the training school can be viewed as the "end of the line" treatment program since in-program failures of other programs are frequently transferred to training schools. Consequently, a graduate to graduate comparison presents an inherent methodological problem.

TABLE 6

SUCCESS RATES BY PROGRAM TYPE

VARIABLE	INTENSIVE COUNSELING GRADUATE	TRAINING SCHOOL CONTROL	
Prior Commitments			
None	75% (54)	53% (16)	Significant at .05 level $X^2 = 3.67$, df = 1
One or more	58% (19)	37% (14)	Significant at .07 level $X^2 = 3.17$, df = 1*
Age			
14	56% (5)	40% (4)	**
15	47% (9)	32% (7)	NS
16	76% (16)	42% (8)	Significant at .06 level $X^2 = 3.51$, df = 1*
17	86% (18)	64% (9)	**
18	73% (8)	50% (1)	**

* This study arbitrarily used the .05 level as the cut-off point in determining significance levels in all other X^2 calculations. Some social scientists, however, use a .10 level. The "near" significance achieved here was considered worthy of citation.

** The cross-tabulation cell frequencies were too small to be reliably interpreted

GRADUATE RECIDIVISM ANALYSIS

Earlier sections of this report have indicated that the overall post-program success rate for Intensive Counseling graduates was 71%. To further explore the relationship between recidivism and background factors known at the time of the youth's entrance into the program, a cross-tabulation procedure utilizing the Chi Square statistical test was employed. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 7.

Of all background variables tested, the success rates were found to be significantly different on one variable, prior referrals.

CONCLUSION

The evaluation of the operation of the Intensive Counseling Program during FY 74-75 has provided favorable results with respect to recidivism, program completion rate and program efficiency. Among these results are the following:

1. The post-program success rate for program graduates with a one-year follow-up was 71%. This is the equivalent of a recidivism rate of 29% which compares favorably with the recidivism rates for other Youth Services Program alternatives.

2. In terms of the number of children completing the program and being furloughed, the program completion rate for Intensive Counseling was 49%. This also compares favorably with the completion rates for Youth Services Programs operating during the same fiscal year.

3. The program has proven to be relatively efficient in that its cost per child per day ($7.23) is less than all other Youth Services' commitment alternatives.

4. The program has met or exceeded the measurable objectives specified in the LEAA grant under which it was funded. Although the population served by the Intensive Counseling Program was found to be somewhat different from that served by training schools; the program provided services for a significant number of children who would have been treated within a training school environment.

Post-program success for graduates of the Intensive Counseling Program was demonstrated to be associated with whites, females, older children, children charged with CINS and property offenses, children with no prior commitments, and children with three or less prior referrals.

TABLE 7

SUCCESS RATES BY SELECTED CATEGORIES

CATEGORY	N	SUCCESS %	
Overall	106	71%	
Black	55	66%	
White	49	78%	
Male	92	68%	
Female	14	86%	
14 years	9	56%	
15 years	19	47%	
16 years	21	76%	
17 years	21	86%	
18 years	11	73%	
Persons Offenders	26	85%	
Property Offenders	54	61%	
CINS Offenders	12	83%	
No Prior Commitments	72	75%	
Prior Commitments	31	61%	
No Prior Probation	17	76%	
Prior Probation	83	71%	
0-3 Prior Referrals	23	96%	Significant at .05 level
4-5 Prior Referrals	27	70%	$X^2 = 8.22$, df = 3
6-7 Prior Referrals	21	62%	
8 or More Prior Referrals	29	66%	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A deinstitutionalization plan calling for the development of additional community-based programs should strongly consider the Intensive Counseling Program. The program's effectiveness (post-program success rate) and efficiency (cost and program completion rate) merit the program's inclusion in any future array of community programs.

2. For reasons of both high program completions and post-program success rates, first commitment youths should be given preference in assignment to the Intensive Counseling Program.

APPENDIX 1

CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS

Murder and non-negligent manslaughter
Negligent manslaughter
Rape
Other felonious sex offenses
Armed robbery
Other robbery
Aggravated Assault
Assault all except aggravated

CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

Arson
Breaking and Entering
Entering without breaking
Auto theft
Grand Larceny
Receiving stolen property
Other felony offenses
Unauthorized use of motor vehicle
Petit larceny
Vandalism
Shoplifting

VICTIMLESS CRIMES

Concealed Firearm
Violation of narcotic drug laws
Marijuana offenses
Violation of other non-narcotic drug laws
Prostitution
Sex offenses not including rape, other felonious offenses, and prostitution
Concealed Weapons, all except firearms
Disorderly Conduct
Traffic/Delinquency
Trespassing
Other Misdemeanor

CINS

Truancy
Violation of curfew
Runaway
Ungovernable behavior
other CINS